UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/564,832	01/17/2006	Robert Fischer	1454.1666	5115

21171   7590   05/19/2009
STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
HASSAN, SARAH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2611	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/19/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>13 April 2009</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>4-7</u> is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>4, 6-7</u> is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) <u>5</u> is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
　　　　　　application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 4-7 are pending.

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed 4/13/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

2.   <u>Applicant's Argument:</u>

3.   On page 6, applicant argues "applicants submit, however, that Yu merely teaches a Tomlinson-Harashima precoding. (See, for example, page 1346, col. 2, starting at line 5). Applicants submit that as understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, a disadvantage of such a precoding method is that no "diversity gain" can be achieved because of the complete prevention (pre-equalizing) of mutual interference signals".... That is, Yu merely teaches a precoding method where a diversity gain can hardly be achieved because the mutual interference signals are also pre-equalized. Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill would not reasonably modify Yu with teaching of Yao.

4.   <u>Examiner's Response:</u>

5.   It should be noted that claim 4 does not mention diversity gain in the claim. However, trellis precoding method and Tomlinson Harashima precoding method are combinable because on page 1344, Yu states that "we will show that a practical trellis

precoding method based on a generalization of Tomlinson-Harashima precoder can be used to approach the capacity for channels with side information, thus approaching the broadcast rate region as well." On page 1347, Yu discloses modifying trellis coding with Tomlinson Harashima for channels with side information, thereby minimizing transmit power for channels with side information as detailed on page 1348.

6.   Applicant's Argument:

7.   On page 7, applicant argues "That is a common transmitter, e.g., in which user signals can be processed, but having "decentralized, non-interconnected" receivers scattered over a service area that cannot cooperate, i.e., each receiver sees only its own receive signal"

8.   By contrast with the recitation of claim 4, Yao merely teaches a method applying to a multi-antenna system, e.g., two transmitting and two receiving antennas system in which all the user receive signals are known on the receive side (channel matrix H Is known at the receiver side) and joint signal processing is possible.

9.   Examiner's Response:

10.   It should be noted that Yu teaches common transmitter in which user signals can be processed, but having "decentralized, non-interconnected" receivers. According to page 1344, Yu states "The downlink direction, where a single transmitter sends independent information to multiple receivers is often modeled as a broadcast channel."

Allowable Subject Matter

2. Claim 5 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 4, 6-7 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yu et. al., "Trellis Precoding for the Broadcast Channel" published in 2001, pages 1344-1348 in view of Yao et. al., "Lattice-Reduction-Aided Detectors for MIMO Communication Systems" published in 2002, pages 424-428.**

5. As to claim 4, Yu teaches "a nonlinear precoding method" [see page 1346, col. 2, lines 7-10; Figure 2] "based on modulo arithmetic for the transmit-side preequalization of K user signals to be transmitted concurrently using a frequency in a digital broadcast channel with known transmission behavior set up

between a central transmitting station and K decentralized, non-interconnected receiving stations" [see page 1344, column 2, lines 1-3]. Yu teaches Tomlinson-Harashima precoder (Figure 2) that operates on a nonlinear basis and is based on the use of "modulo arithmetic" or modulo-M geometry as disclosed in Yu [see page 1346, col. 2, lines 16-21]. In addition Yu also teaches using the Tomlinson-Harashima precoder in an environment where transmitted symbols are corrupted in a broadcast channel due to interference as detailed on page 1344, col. 2, equation 4. Equation 4 discloses s_k which exemplifies the interference known to the transmitter but not the receiver. The interference arises as a result when the transmitter sends information to two ore more "decentralized, non-interconnected receiving stations" at a time as detailed on page 1344, column 2, lines 1-4.

"the user signals consisting of data symbols ak with k from 1 to K from a signal constellation having Mk levels and a signal point spacing Ak with a periodic multiple representation of the undisturbedly transmitted data symbols ak in data symbol intervals congruent for K receive-side modulo decision devices" [see page 1347, col. 2, lines 9-15]. Yu proposes a trellis constellation diagram or "data symbols ak with k from 1 to K from a signal constellation having Mk levels and a signal point spacing Ak with a periodic multiple representation of the undisturbedly transmitted data symbols ak in data symbol intervals." The trellis code can be combined with Tomlinson precoding to be used as reconstruction values to determine path metrics for synchronization purposes and to help mitigate the effects of the interference components in a data symbol 'ak'.

"a transmit-power-minimizing selection of representatives" and "linear preequalization of the selected representatives Vk to form transmit signals xk to be transmitted" [see page 1345, col. 1, last paragraph]. Yu discloses subtracting interference at the transmitter (preequalization) instead of subtracting interference at the receiver, thereby performing "transmit-power -minimizing selection" because it the transmit power allocated to transmit data symbols to be mitigated with the help of trellis coding as detailed in page 1347, col. 2, 2nd paragraph.

"including interference symbols in the digital broadcast channel superimposed on the data symbols ak" [see page 1347, Figure 4]. Yu teaches Tomlison Harashima precoder (Figure 4) that is responsible for adding interference and quantization noise to the data symbols and sending information regarding these noise components to the decoder at the receiver through a "digital broadcast channel" as detailed on page 1347, col. 1, lines 6-11.

It should be noted however that Yu does not specifically teach "eliminating the interference symbols by the K receive-side modulo decision devices."

On the other hand, Yao teaches "eliminating the interference symbols by the K receive-side modulo decision devices" [see page 424, col.1-col. 2]. Yao teaches a receiver that detects a transmitted signal and has predetermined knowledge of the channel, in order to eliminate "interference symbols."

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Yu with the teachings of Yao because Yao mitigates the effects

of multiuser detection problems such as interference in a MIMO system, thereby

enhancing the performance of a multi-user communication system as detailed in

page 424, col. 1.

6. As to claims 6 and 7, Yu teaches "offset compensation is already carried out on

the transmit signals Xk prior to transmission" [see page 1345, col. 1, last

paragraph]. Yu teaches subtracting interference or providing "offset

compensation" at the transmitter "prior to transmission."

Conclusion

1.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SARAH HASSAN whose telephone number is (571)270-3456. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday (available 8:00 AM - 5:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mohammad Ghayour can be reached on (571) 272-3021. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sarah Hassan/
Examiner, Art Unit 2611

/Mohammad H Ghayour/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2611